Case4:11-cr-00742-SBA Document7 Filed04/20/11 Page1 of 1

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA OAKLAND DIVISION



United States of America,	RICHARD W. WIEKING Case No. CR - 11 - 703 69 MAGORIHERN DISTRICT COURT
${\it Plaintiff}, \ { m v}.$) STIPULATED ORDER EXCLUDING TIME) UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT
TUSHAR TAMBE,	
Defendant.	<i>)</i>
Speedy Trial Act from APPL 20, 2011 to M	, 2011, the Court excludes time under the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. § ases this continuance on the following factor(s):
Failure to grant a continuance would See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i).	be likely to result in a miscarriage of justice.
defendants, the nature of the property or law, that it is unreasonable to expe	due to [check applicable reasons] the number of rosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial by this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).
Failure to grant a continuance would taking into account the exercise of du	deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, the diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).
Failure to grant a continuance would counsel's other scheduled case comm See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).	unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given itments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.
necessary for effective preparation, ta	unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time king into account the exercise of due diligence.
	TIME PURSUANT TO 18 USC & 31616), AND USE 5.16) AND BASED UPON THE PARTIES CONSENT.
STIPULATED:	United States Magistrate Judge
Attorney for Defendant	Assistant United States Attorney

District Court
Criminal Case Processing